

### **REMARKS**

Claim 21 has been cancelled. Claim 16 has been amended to include claim 21, and to delete the phrase "the ceramic accounts for 10 to 90% by weight of the ceramic coated fiber", which had been previously added in the Amendment and Request for Reconsideration filed February 16, 2007.

New claim 39 has been added. New claim 39 corresponds to claim 20, which was cancelled in the Amendment and Request for Reconsideration filed February 16, 2007.

New claims 40-42 have been added as withdrawn claims. New claims 40-42 correspond to original claims 22-24, respectively, which were subject to a restriction requirement as noted in the Office Action mailed on June 1, 2006.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 16-19 and 28-42 are present in the application, and claims 16-19 and 28-39 are active. Applicants would like to thank Examiner Gray for indicating that cancelled claim 21 and claims 28-35 are free of the prior art.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Gray for the helpful discussion with Applicants' representative on June 19, 2007. During this discussion, the references of record were reviewed with respect to independent claim 16.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The rejections of claims 16-19 and 36-38 as anticipated by or, in the alternative, obvious over, Nam et al. ("Preparation and characterization of TiO<sub>2</sub> fiber and its photocatalytic properties", Paper # 291) and Kim et al. ("Preparation of TiO<sub>2</sub> Fiber and its Photocatalytic Properties", Materials Science Forum, vol. 439, pp. 271-276 (2003)) have been obviated by appropriate amendment. Claim 21 has been incorporated into independent claim 16, from which claims 17-19 and 36-38 depend. Neither Nam et al. nor Kim et al. disclose or suggest a ceramic coated fiber that includes a fiber and a

ceramic, coated on the fiber, where the ceramic has a BET surface area of at least 60 m<sup>2</sup>/g, where the ceramic includes crystalline ceramic, and where the ceramic includes silver and/or palladium. Accordingly, claims 16-19 and 36-38 are neither anticipated by, nor obvious over, the applied references. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

### Request for Rejoinder

Applicants request rejoinder of new withdrawn claims 40-42. Original claims 22-24, to which these new claims correspond, were subject to a restriction requirement as noted in the Office Action mailed June 1, 2006. Claims 40-42 depend from claim 17. Accordingly, if claim 17 is allowable, the restriction of claims 40-42 should be withdrawn, as noted in MPEP § 821.04.


### CONCLUSION

All of the grounds raised in the present Office Action for rejecting the application are believed to be overcome or rendered moot based on the remarks above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently presented claims are in form for allowance, and such action is requested. Should the Examiner feel a discussion would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at (312) 876-1400.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 9, 2007

Evan Law Group LLC  
600 West Jackson Blvd., Suite 625  
Chicago, IL 60661  
(312) 876-1400

  
Jonathan P. Taylor, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 48,338